UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Contributors to This Issue:

A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
EDWIN D. MEAD
RICHARD B. GREGG
VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH
T. RICHARD WITMER

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS
MILDRED FOWLER FIELD
CHARLES G. GIRELIUS
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
TARAKNATH DAS
ALICE STONE BLACKWELL

VOLUME CVIII NUMBER 14

Chicago, December 21, 1931

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 219
A Problem for Christianity—A. EUSTACE HAYDON 221
Jottings—J. H. H 222
ARTICLES—
The Moral of the Navy League Flurry—EDWIN D. MEAD 223
Some Useful Results of the Second Round Table Conference—RICHARD B. GREGG 225
A Christmas Meditation—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 227
Toward a Solution of the Injunction Problem—T. RICHARD WITMER 227
POETRY—
Hymn—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 219
Reflections on Dickens' Christmas Carol—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 226
They Wait—MILDRED FOWLER FIELD 229
The Christmas Treat—CHARLES G. GIRELIUS 229
THE STUDY TABLE—
"Greatest Thoughts on Immortality"—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW 230
West Meets East—TARAKNATH DAS 230
CORRESPONDENCE—
Friends of Russia—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 231
THE FIELD—
National Suicide—*William E. Borah* 218
International Standards for Prison Conditions—The Howard League for Prison Reform 218

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

National Suicide

"When this (Geneva) conference convenes in February, there will be in the leading nations of the world from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 men and women unemployed. If we include dependents, it is safe to say that at that time some 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 men, women and children will be facing hunger and nakedness, with only the uncertain hand of charity to save them from starvation. One of the great contributing causes to this intolerable situation is this ever-increasing burden of armaments, together with the demoralizing forces which accompany it. For the last two years governments have devised schemes and searched for means and methods to take care of those who were unable to take care of themselves. We have appealed to charity, we have laid still heavier taxes, already destructive; we have sought to economize here and there. We have cut the dole, we have withheld Federal aid, but the war budget and the armament expenditures do not come down—measured from year to year, they increase. While millions are on the verge of starvation, growing restless and ugly, nearly $5,000,000,000 is being annually expended for armaments and from 80 per cent to 85 per cent of all taxes extorted from the people go for war purposes. All this is another name for slow but inevitable national suicide."—*William E. Borah.*

International Standards for Prison Conditions

[The following is the substance of a memorandum submitted to the League of Nations by the Howard League for Prison Reform. Improvement of prison conditions and treatment of prisoners is a subject which has recently claimed much attention in India, and the following will, therefore, be of special interest to Indians.]

Evidence of Abuses

The Howard League for Prison Reform believes that in every country there are abuses which mar the administration of the Law Courts, Prisons and Police Cells. The following selections have been made from a mass of evidence in the League's possession, though the names of the States concerned, and of the victims, are not given because experience has shown that to depart from anonymity may bring reprisals on the prisoners. The Howard League takes full responsibility for the reliability of its witnesses and for the truth of the following instances:

Men wearing a heavy iron ball chained to their ankles were forced to spend eight hours a day for three months wheeling the ball in a wheelbarrow round and round the prison yard under the supervision of armed warders. They spent the rest of the

(*Continued on page* 231)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CVIII MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1931 Number 14

HYMN

[Written in the Red Square, Moscow, under the Kremlin Wall]

When God was lord, and Tsar was king,
This wall entomb'd the world,
And from the ramparts of its pride
The shafts of fury hurl'd.

When God was king, and Tsar was lord,
These towers eclipsed the sky—
These golden crosses dar'd the stars
Their splendor to defy.

When God was God, and Tsar was Tsar,
And God and Tsar were one,
Here, in this templ'd citadel
The doom of men was done.

Now Tsars are dead, and God denied,
And lo, this mound of stone
A barricade of Liberty
For humble men and lone!

O Thou, whose spirit moves the deep,
And tells the toll of days,
Thou askest not for name or sign,
Thou seekest not for praise.

Unrecognized, unseen, unknown,
Thou waitest patient still,
Content if men unwittingly
Contrive to do thy will.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Indian situation presents a sinister paradox. On the one hand, with a supreme gesture of Olympian grace, like the Almighty handing down benefactions from the skies, Premier MacDonald grants (so he says!) the demands of India. His speech at the last session of the Round Table Conference was rapturously hailed by Englishmen, American newspapers, Indian moderates, as the solution of the problem with which the Conference had been wrestling. Only Gandhi reserved judgment. On the other hand, repressive measures of the greatest rigor were enacted in India, the threat of the iron hand was proffered against resistance, and vague rumors were passed about of the Mahatma's deportation and exile to the Andaman Islands. This is an amazing combination of events, obviously meaning on the part of Britain that the Indians must now take what MacDonald in his infinite wisdom and with his Tory backing is willing to grant. And what does he grant? A federated India, to be sure, which does not in any remotest degree touch the question of a free India! Beyond this, he concedes nothing but the same old promises with which India has been fooled and fooled for more than a dozen years. There was nothing in the Prime Minister's speech to meet Gandhi's uncompromising demand for "freedom unadulterated" for the "dumb, semi-starved millions" of his countrymen—nothing even to fulfil the solemn pledges made to the Mahatma by Lord Irwin when the former consented to sign the truce and go to England. Gandhi can of course reach no decision until he arrives in India and confers with the members of the All-India Congress. But it is not to be believed that the Indians will consent to any peace upon the basis of the MacDonald statement. What future policy will be rests in the hands of a man who is as wise as he is saintly and heroic. The forecast of events, therefore, should not be difficult.

Rumors persist that the Geneva Disarmament Conference may be postponed because of the fear of the great powers that it may fail. Be not deceived! If the Disarmament Conference is postponed, it will be because of the fear of the great powers that it may succeed. When this Conference was arranged, none of the nations took it very seriously. It would be just one more gathering where much was said and little done. But a great body of public opinion has been rolling up behind this Geneva affair. America has shown an extraordinary interest, and proposes to come to the Conference with a thorough-going program of arms reduction. The little nations are in a fighting mood, and cannot be trusted to keep quiet. The German people regard the February meeting with an almost pitiful concern and of course will listen to nothing but a drastic cutting of armaments in fulfilment of the solemn pledge of the Versailles Treaty. Then there is Soviet Russia, always challenging the world to immediate and complete disarmament. What are the great powers going to do in the face of a popular sentiment such as this? How can France, with its own people quite as eager for relief as the other peoples of Europe, maintain that unyielding military policy in which her politicians see their own security in the exact measure of the insecurity of other coun-

tries? This disarmament movement is getting out of hand. Hence the desire of the governments of France, Poland, Italy, and now of Tory England, to postpone the Geneva meeting, in the confident hope that the war in Manchuria, an upset in Germany, a new panic against Russia, will change the situation in a way to make disarmament impossible! It is impressive evidence of the temper and power of public opinion that no nation is yet ready to take the first step toward delay. The fear of popular opprobrium is too great. Now let this public opinion maintain and assert itself anew, for if the disarmament fight is ever to be won, it must be won *now*.

What respect has Asia for Europe? None at all, if events since the Great War are any evidence. In that fierce and awful struggle in 1914-1918, the peoples of India, China, Japan saw suddenly revealed the suicidal weakness of white civilization. Since that time they have seen this same civilization rent and torn with jealousies, stricken by economic misery and disaster, and preparing again feverishly for another war. Supremely evident has been the inability of Western nations to agree on anything, or to present a united front against anybody. Asia, long cowed by superstitious fear of Europe, suddenly saw its day of emancipation at hand. China threw off its exploiters as a terrier shakes off rats, and entered bravely if confusedly upon its own independent national existence. India, moved to dignity and power by the exalted example of Mahatma Gandhi, began a revolt against Britain which has already loosened the hold of the Empire upon its victims. Japan, pretending to enter the Great War, used the distress of its allies as an opportunity for advancing its own interests on the Asiatic continent, and now, utterly contemptuous of the nations whose militaristic methods it has aped so well, moves swiftly and surely to its end of swallowing Manchuria. In the face of this continental uprising of brown and yellow peoples, the white stand paltering and faltering, not knowing what to do. All of which, however bad for Europe, is good for Asia, and ultimately for the world, for it is good that all peoples should be free! The one evil in the situation is Japan, which is untrue to itself in its deliberate acceptance and use of the worst instead of the best phases of Western example. Unless Japan stops or is stopped in time, Asia will in due course have her own "Great War," with ruin commensurate with that of Europe today.

Every now and then there comes over us the conviction that all the pacifists have to do in order to win their cause is to leave the militarists alone and thus let them destroy themselves. Take this recent Navy League fracas, for example! How many citizens of this country want to entrust the welfare of the United States to such men as released this wild attack upon the President? If the policy of armed preparedness —by armies and big navies—is the product of this type of mind, then the sooner we abandon it, the better. Another even more delicious example of militaristic mentality has recently been reported to us from California. It seems that last month a great scene of mimic aerial warfare was staged by the U. S. Navy, the U. S. Army Air Corps Reserve, and the California National Guard. In order to make things as dramatic as possible, it was assumed, in the childish way characteristic of performances of this kind, that an enemy had invaded California and penetrated as far south as Los Angeles. An imaginative combat zone, where this enemy was supposed to be entrenched, was duly established just outside the city. Upon this zone a fleet of airplanes was to be released, to be met in turn by enemy planes, with a great battle over the metropolitan area as the terrific climax of the demonstration. And—believe it or not!—the time appointed by the army and navy half-wits for this affair was *Sunday morning,* the planes to take off at 10:55, and the battle to be joined at 12 noon! *Precisely the church hour!* The sham war went off according to schedule, and the net result, so far as we can make out, was such an uprising of Christians against armies and navies and bombing planes and war generally as the world has never seen before. For once the churches were a unit against militarism. Protests went thundering to Washington. Pacifism, for a few days at least, was more popular in southern California than the wildest radical had ever dared to conceive as possible. So we say—leave it to the military! Their folly will do more for peace than all the wisdom of the reformers.

There seems to be a wise chief of police in the city of Washington. In the face of a deliberately wicked attempt, fomented by the government Secret Service and encouraged by the newspapers, to represent the recent (so-called) "hunger march" as a diabolical Communist conspiracy for the overthrow of American institutions, this police chief—Brigadier-General Pelham D. Glassford, by name—kept his head and incidentally kept order. He saw no "army" in these "hunger" marchers, and therefore no "invasion" of the capitol. On the contrary, he styled the thousand and more forlorn protestors as "just tourists coming to Washington," and treated them with every hospitality. Thus, he provided police escort for their protection, barracks for their sleeping, food for their hunger, and a program of hearings and reception for their complaints. Even the Vice-President was persuaded to meet them and confer with them upon their troubles. And of all these troubles, the most serious was the fact that they were not allowed to have serious trouble with the authorities. It looked in the beginning, when the Secret Service made themselves ridiculous by describing as a secret plot what the Com-

munists had been openly proclaiming in their public press for months, as though disturbances, even bloodshed, was in prospect. But thanks to General Glassford and his insistence that the "hunger marchers" had not only the right but the duty to come to Washington and present their grievances, there was a peacefulness about the whole demonstration which utterly disappointed the agitators who thrive on opposition. Indeed, so embarrassed were the Communist leaders in being received with open arms instead of with clenched fists, that they announced belligerently that they didn't intend to be "coddled" by the Washington police, and sought consolation in vigorous protest against the quality of the board and lodging which were freely provided for their followers. All of which is highly amusing! But there is also the very solemn side. When will all officers in authority learn not only the kindliness but the supreme efficacy of dealing with our enemies with the methods of non-resistance?

We remember the first time we heard the late Vachel Lindsay read—and the last time, too! It was as though one of the old troubadors, or minnesingers, had come back to earth. What a lilt was in his voice, what a beating rhythm in his whole body! This man believed that poetry had something to do with song. He was impatient, this modern minstrel, with all the vagaries of the so-called "free verse" of our time which was nothing more than sentences of prose broken up arbitrarily into lines and stanzas, and called as arbitrarily poetry. He believed in beauty of word, in fitness of phrase—he could catch a gleam of magic utterance as successfully as Keats or Poe. But his verse must be first and last a chant, a song—something to read upon the lips and to be heard within the ear. What wonder that he wandered the countryside and recited his poetry for a noon meal or a night's lodging! Not the least of Lindsay's great services was his restoration of literature to the people and of poetry to the living heart of man. Unforgettable are such poems as "The Congo," "General William Booth Enters Heaven," "The Daniel Jazz," "The Ghosts of the Buffaloes." Vachel Lindsay could be enchanting, as in his "Chinese Nightingale," and grotesque, as in his "Bryan, Bryan, Bryan." He could be trivial, as in much of "Going to the Sun," and sublime, as in his "Abraham Lincoln Walks at Midnight." Infinitely tender and beautiful are his "moon" poems for children, and one of the great elegies of all time is his lament for Altgelt, "The Eagle That is Forgotten." In his later years, the poet became fantastic and not seldom utterly unimportant. His faults overcame his peculiar virtues, and smothered the flame of inspiration in his soul. But Vachel Lindsay's early volumes remain as landmarks in the literary history of our time, and his "Collected Poetry" (Macmillan) stands as one of the few permanent contributions of this generation to the glorious literature of our English tongue. It is pleasant to recall Lindsay's visit some years ago to England, and his rapturous welcome by the public. Long since he had become an international as well as a national figure, and he died, untimely, with his fame secure.

A Problem for Christianity

Christianity is unique among the religions of the earth in the fact that it has never been completely oriented to life in this world. Other religions, in ages of defeat and disillusion, have projected compensatory ideals into a future age or to another level of reality, but the strong roots of their infancy and youth remained in the soil of everyday fact. The patterns of behavior in family and community life remained as before a part of religion and under its sanction. But Christianity had no infancy. It sprang full grown as a religion of salvation from the union of old cultures. The early churches were in the world but not of it. Instead of saving the social order they rescued men from it to a new brotherhood. This peculiar emphasis has remained in the Christianity of history, although a thousand years of political and cultural responsibility, from the 4th to the 14th centuries, seemed to be transforming Christianity also into a religion dominating all phases of human life. But that was the end, for, while the Roman Church still claims authority over all of life, the claim is nowhere actualized and Protestant Christianity was one of the factors which completed the destruction of the 13th century synthesis of religion and life. The secular life molded by politics, business, science, philosophy, education and art became something apart from religion. Some Protestant groups crusaded for the separation of church and state, for the separation of religion from education. Even morality was not important in itself but only as the fruit of a supernatural experience of regeneration. The church was a divine insert into history to save the individual. Such individuals might indeed act as leaven in the world, but the only technique of the church for saving society was the "foolishness of preaching," "to tell again the old eternal truth and let that work."

Now liberal Christianity is confronted with a perplexing problem. Science has destroyed the supernatural superstructure of religion. Secular civilization, served by science and lacking the control of any unifying social idealism, has become a maze of conflicting interests resulting in ever more tragic maladjustments of groups, colors, classes and nations. In the presence

of these problems modern liberal Christians seek not only to be Samaritans but to change society. That is, they want to organize business about an ideal of commonweal, to make education a means to full and joyous living, to have science and the machines humanized and harnessed to share human programs. They want "to put religion into politics." In a word, they would make religious idealism the pattern upon which all the various phases of life might be organized into a culture for the perfecting of man. At last religion is to be in Christian as in other cultures a way of living.

But there are difficulties at once. The secular world protests that the church and religion have nothing to do with politics and business. Orthodox Christianity agrees. When Mr. Fosdick preaches on "Capitalism and Communism" the Chicago *Journal of Commerce* rebukes him and laments that only the village and small town preachers are using the pulpit to spread the gospel. When ministers make known their anti-war attitude and threaten to sabotage the military machine they are abused and denounced for meddlesome interference. When they take the leadership in an effort to achieve a political change, they are reminded of the sacred principle of separation of church and state. They are expected to proclaim the consolations of religion, the saving grace and love of God and the beauty of noble ideals. This may be a great service to the world, a "stabilizing influence in society," that may be worth paying for. But to make these old ideals mean something in terms of concrete human relations, to give religion a more practical program is shocking, subversive, revolutionary. Thus the church reaps the fruit of her own sowing. No repentance or suffering, however great, is adequate to atone for the colossal blunder of allowing the scientific civilization of the West to sprawl and ramify into such gigantic proportions without plan, without the unifying direction of a social, religious ideal. The whole world now suffers from that mistake. Christian missionaries hasten to explain that western civilization must not be confused with Christianity. The Christian West is not Christian. Why not? The blame can fall in only one place.

If religion is to be the unifying pattern of life and all phases of the "secular" civilization are to serve as creators and conservers of values of a shared life, the new Christianity must be something different from the historic type. The Church must face the necessity of losing itself that religion may achieve a more adequate organization. Priest and preacher will no longer be the unique religious leaders. They will share that function with experts in all branches of science, education, business, art and politics who are capable of solving problems and creating the social structures which will actualize the desired ideals. This is the problem of Christianity. It is doubtful whether even our liberals are willing to wipe out the old distinction of sacred and secular frankly and thoroughly. A nostalgia for another level of reality and a loyalty to the church may make the problem insoluble and leave the task of creating the new world culture to the leadership of Oriental peoples. A. EUSTACE HAYDON.

Jottings

"London, Dec. 2.—The Prince of Wales today was suffering from a slight chill and was confined to his room."

"London, Dec. 2.—The Mahatma Gandhi . . . was sent to bed tonight with a feverish cold."

The weather, like God, is no respecter of persons.

Mahatma Gandhi appears for the first time this year in the English "Who's Who." Now at last the English will learn who this man is.

Ph.D. degrees are not so useless after all! A recent survey shows that women holding Ph.D. degrees have "the highest median salary," $4,105, and are secure in their positions, as compared with other women in this period of depression. "The recipe for success," says Professor Harry A. Overstreet, "is to take a Ph.D. degree."

Professor Millikan has smashed an atom—and nothing has happened! But why did we believe that something would happen? Who said, and why, that there was energy enough in an atom, if released, to destroy the earth? Is this not one more evidence that the mythology of religion is matched only by the mythology of science?

The proposal to get rid of Mr. Hoover as the Republican candidate for the presidency in the next campaign brings inevitably to mind the story of Jonah. But in the scriptures it is said that, when the storm threatened to engulf the ship, it was Jonah himself who offered to save the situation. "Take me up, and cast me forth into the sea; so shall the sea be calm unto us." Will Herbert Hoover follow this great example?

If the American ambassador to Great Britain is nominated next year for the presidency, it will be a case of the Democrats preparing a platform "for Dawes to peck at"! J. H. H.

The Moral of the Navy League Flurry

It would be as foolish as false to say that the Navy League gentlemen who so vehemently denounce the President are not sincere in their passion. Guns and gun-boats, as I explained in a recent article, are the exponents of their loyalty and their measures of patriotism. It would be foolish to say that the showy heads of the national governing body of the Daughters of the American Revolution, who meet for their annual soirees and caucuses in their luxurious quarters at Washington, are not sincere in their business and are not "patriotic" after their kind; although it is a kind of patriotism which the fathers of the Revolution and the Republic would not recognize as anything they ever had to do with. Their speeches betray no inkling of any idea of what the American Revolution meant or what American democracy means. They would be scared to death by any robust speech about the views of Washington, Franklin and Jefferson; and references to these worthies rarely get into reports of their proceedings. Their president recently declined to take part in a meeting in Boston for the reason, frankly avowed, that the secretary of the Council for the Prevention of War was to take part; she would not sit on the platform with him. Had he been concerned with Preparation for War, she would doubtless have come with alacrity. Her predecessor in her exalted office was of the same doctrinal dye and more flamboyant. These fashionable dignitaries, custodians of a high and regnant consecration which has been prostituted to such cheap and worldly ends, are confidently relied upon to lead their fashionable following at each annual meeting up to the Capitol to register backing for a bigger navy, at some Congressional hearing, quite oblivious of the fact that George Washington's "first wish was to see war, the plague of mankind, banished from the earth," and that the peace doctrines of Jefferson and Franklin, especially in their dread of great navies, were far more radical. Yet the "patriotic" dames who cluster periodically at Washington are always intent to bolster "preparedness for war," especially at sea, while never deviating into countenance of the peace meeting around the corner.

It seems incumbent to notice here this recreancy at the top of a great organization pledged to so high a purpose and capable of signal service to the country; because its spirit and performances coincide with those of the fine gentlemen of the Navy League under survey. No reflection upon the national administration of this body has application to the faithful work of hundreds of local chapters which we know so well and value so truly; nor do we fail to recognize the robust revolt now rising among leading women in the society all over the country, which must eventually make it true again to its baptism and its definition. The Washington Bicentenary strikes the propitious hour for this restoration.

The pertinent point is that these fine women who function at Washington and the fine gentlemen of the Navy League who function at Washington are counterparts. They hunt in couples, two sections of the same phalanx. The women of the League, for women there are, are surely sympathetic sisters of the Daughters who adorn the lounge of their Washington home; and there is doubtless much interlocking in the memberships. The standards of patriotism and of American life in the two bodies are the same; and both as now controlled are a menace. "Patriotism" to the ripe "Daughters" is the "drum and trumpet" sort, like that of the village boys the night before the "Fourth"; it would be dull and flat without the smack of powder. Patriotism to the Navy League is measured similarly by explosives, by steel cruisers and eight-inch guns.

I mistake the temper of the American people if their patience with a "patriotism" of fad and frills, or a fashion of cultivating "preparedness for war" long endures. America and Europe are too sharply up against the penalties of the most tragic and costly blunder in history, brought on by the excesses of a false patriotism and the excesses of preparedness for war. The World War itself was the complete and final answer to the preaching that the way to avoid war is to prepare for it. Never was such preparedness for war as that of the European nations which plunged into war in 1914. Every nation was an armed camp. Preparedness for war had been their major concern. They prepared for war, and they got what they prepared for. Ten million men were killed and ten million more were wrecked for life, because the men who precipitated the war blundered. Their confession that they blundered does not bring those millions of fine fellows back to life. But their blood rises to heaven proclaiming that such "blunders" must cease; and the confession should bring all men to their senses. The three responsible English statesmen of 1914, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George and Lord Grey, all publicly declared at a later time that they had misread the European situation. Lord Grey wrote that he was convinced that neither the German emperor nor the chancellor planned or desired the war, but that they were the victims of military conditions too much for them. Lloyd George spoke for all the responsible English statesmen when he declared that all the nations "stumbled and staggered" into the war together. As we ourselves look back at it now, was the damage which we suffered, which was our excuse for entering the war, damage inflicted by German ships not in enmity to us but incidental to war with others, sufficient to balance the awful loss of life and wealth which we incurred, with the chief result of prolonging the war and with no assurance that the outcome was beneficent? The one constructive and important result was the founding by our President of the League of Nations; yet by mournful irony ours is the one great civilized power which has not yet joined the League, although we may trust it will do so tomorrow.

The cost of it all in wealth staggers humanity at this hour almost as much as its cost in blood. This alone might deter men of the Navy League order from pressing anew the policies which wrought the catastrophe. The whole western world is in a depression and poverty unexampled and which will long continue. The people struggle, and will struggle yearly, to raise millions for the unemployed threatened with starvation; but this is but a slight item in the burden imposed by the war. Sir Philip Gibbs, speaking for England, reiterates yesterday with power what he has been emphasizing for ten years, that the root cause of the financial and economic hardship everywhere was that the inherited wealth of the world was so largely de-

stroyed by the war, and there can be no reliable or permanent relief save through "the steady toil of millions working in security and in an orderly scheme of life." "We must get back somehow," he says, " to the eternal realities of earning what we spend." Much of the world's wealth "has been blown away"; and of England he says that "in her four and a half years of war she spent as much as in the two and a half centuries before the war." Of the United States, Calvin Coolidge says that when in some distant time all the pensions and other costs are paid, our eighteen months in the war will have cost us $100,000,000,000! Yet there are men who still ask why we are poor and pinched and all enterprises suffer. It seems to many that men who continue to support the system which brought all this about are not serious men. It seems that the Navy League cannot be serious.

Yet while all this should be pressed far enough, it should not be pressed too far. It should not be pressed too far with a man like William Howard Gardiner. There are all sorts in the Navy League. There are men on the make, hunting for armament contracts and subsidizing Shearers to hang around Disarmament conferences. There are high society folk who like rear-admirals at dinner. There are robuster men who hunger for the prestige of a navy—for what purpose or at what cost they do not care—"bigger than any other in the world." But there is another class, more portentous and more respectable, more respectable even when its astigmatism and violent partisanship make it as parsimonious of the truth as it is lavish in insolence. If it puts inaccuracy and whitewash to quick use, it is because its strategy is short-sighted, and any available weapons must serve in a conflict to it so serious and urgent. Such a serious man I conceive one like William Howard Gardiner. He and men like him are afraid. They live in real fear lest in some whirligig of fortune, of which history is so full, a British fleet may suddenly be bombarding New York, or Japan bombing San Francisco, Japan's umbrage at our slights is never far below the surface; and not only Britain but all Europe resent our high tariffs, so crushing to their industry and trade in this hour of their distress. Latin America, full of jealousy of us and dread of our further interference, may suddenly unite against us; or Soviet Russia may run amuck against the whole capitalistic world. All our own interests and civilization itself may then depend alike upon a big American navy. All Asia indeed, everywhere seething in revolution, may run amuck against the whole white race. The entire horizon is lurid to those who see red; and the Navy League always sees red. In more modest flights, these "big business" apostles of a big navy never forget how handy it might at any moment prove, as it has often proved, in those questionable adventures where big business assumes a sort of divine right.

And meantime we are fearfully exposed. The two oceans, which most of us have counted our chief security, Mr. Gardiner counts our chief danger, open and inviting pathways to our vulnerable shores. This is the chief provocation of his nightmares and the central thesis of his political life, although it has been almost entirely overlooked. His sketch of himself in "Who's Who" revolves around it. It is a brief sketch, but it takes room for this rather remarkable statement of what he thinks he chiefly is and stands for: "Author of view that North America, particularly the U. S., has ceased being virtually self-sufficient, and is taking on the character and outlook of a great island centrally placed in the oceanic world."

Well, Mr. Gardiner is quite right. But why does the discovery seem to him so surprising? Why was he so late in making it? Why does he draw such strange inferences from it? Africa and South America are islands, Canada and Mexico are exposed, or protected, just as the United States is; and measurably so are India and Brazil. The whole world is exposed. The dependence of Britain upon safe and open sea routes, greater than ours today, will still be greater tomorrow, but not the next day. Not only has the United States, as Mr. Gardiner has suddenly perceived, "ceased to be self-sufficient," but every place in the civilized world is "centrally placed," or in the strategy of world advance may prove to be so tomorrow. The revolution shifts the whole problem of "national defence." No nation on earth can alone in a major modern conflict defend itself today. Reliance upon navies to do it has become juvenile. Admiral Sims had the wit to see and say three years ago that in case of any serious attack upon us the best thing our big battleships could do would be to push as far as possible up the Missisippi River. Even that would be no refuge from the bombing airplanes of that day. Before William Howard Gardiner is three score and ten, not one of the $40,000,000 battleships or the $20,000,000 cruisers so dear to his heart will be in existence. He and his kind talk of the government's abysmal ignorance of "what our navy is for." Far more abysmal is their blindness as to whither all navies are hastening. Has Mr. Gardiner ever ventured to frame his conception of "what a navy is for"? It would make good "copy" for the New York newspapers at this time; and it would certainly be a "curiosity of literature" a dozen years hence.

Its character can be guessed perhaps from the radio address of Admiral Fiske on Armistice Day.

Admiral Fiske "qualifies" by endorsing at the start Mr. Gardiner's attack on President Hoover. He frankly emphasizes the fact indeed that Mr. Gardiner is his pupil. The President's policy "may get us into another war in which we may be conquered on the sea and despoiled of all our wealth. Pacifist policies of unpreparedness got us into the War of 1812, the Civil War, and the World War. The real reason for our failure to keep up an adequate army and navy is cowardice, fear of the danger and inconvenience of war." Without reviewing Admiral Fiske's humorous historical accomplishments, one wonders just how he pictures Great Britain or another, after conquering us on the sea, "despoiling us of all our wealth." Would the invading force, landing at the Battery, begin by loading the material of the Empire State building, the new Waldorf Astoria and the George Washington Bridge for re-erection in its home capital? Would it levy on the Chamber of Commerce ten billions in greenbacks or drafts on London? Would it move in relays by the Limited, or by the Chesapeake waterway, through an amazed but paralyzed population, to seize our "gold hoard" in the Treasury vaults at Washington? Would it annex New England to Canada? These vaporings about "looting" the United States—and hordes of big navy men sanction and practice them—are born of a youthful psychology nursed on romances of "the Spanish main" and vicissitudes which, if not

so remote in time, are yet remoter in fact, from the conditions and problems of today.

These old men of the sea who picture conquerors and looters are of sundry sorts, but all see the same species of spooks; and they do not represent the sanity which controls the United States navy. Secretary Adams of the Navy Department spoke by the card when, in defending the President from the Navy League propaganda, he declared that there was no sympathy with it among the strong men of the navy. All this talk of a "treaty navy" and "building up to parity" is the talk of men abysmally ignorant of the London treaty or utterly indifferent to truth and honor. Admiral Pratt, chief of naval operations, speaks the voice of sanity when he says that "no right-thinking man in the navy would want such a thing"; and every informed man, in or out of the navy, knows that the London treaty, although of course conferring upon all parties to it the abstract right of building up to treaty limits never contemplated that it would actually be done.

When the talk is of "cowardice," there is no other cowardice so cowardly, so poisonous, or so peurile as that of admirals and generals shivering in their night-shirts in fear that at the cock-crowing some Invincible Armada may forge out of the Nowhere into the Here and suddenly subjugate and loot this strongest nation in the world. When the talk is of risks, do these trembling heroes ever compare the risks of peace to their country with the risks of war? The great world issue of today is precisely whether men and nations will be controlled by war or by faith.

It accuses us that in this time of such serious issues we give so much rope to this sort of thing. For every serious American it ought to be as fatuous and impossible to think of our fighting England or Japan as to think of the New York police fighting the police of Philadelphia. We have been slow to take to heart the teaching of our own Emerson, so signally enforced by the history of the last twenty years, that war altogether belongs to the juvenile stage of human development, and that the time has come for us to act like men. We may not close our eyes to the confusion and the barbarism, the hatreds and rivalries, which still menace and will continue to menace men and nations. Of course the world must be policed; but national armies enforcing each the claims of its own government—judge, jury and executioner in its own case—are not police. The sea must be policed; and the great rival navies which have made the seas their battle-ground and a scene of terror will vanish, replaced by a real naval police, to which the maritime nations may contribute their small quotas. Thus will the great demand and prophecy of our own Franklin and Jefferson for the freedom and safety of the seas be realized. Maturity of knowledge and of judgment surely prescribes that the only hopeful or possible course for effective dealing with the world's present problem is not the hoary old way of a proud nationalism and brute force, the way of self-sufficiency and self-assertion, but the brave advancement of the new instruments, already so complete, of international law and order, of mutual confidence and cooperation among men.

EDWIN D. MEAD.

Some Useful Results of the Second Round Table Conference

It is now clear that Britain will not yield the essential demands of the Indian National Congress without further intense struggle in India. British high finance is in difficulties and regards the Congress demands as tantamount to very severe loss of British investments in India. The interests of British industry, trade and navigation fear that a free India would mean much more severe competition with other nations for Indian supplies and trade, and the ending of the practical monopoly of British shipping in Indian sea-borne commerce. The British ruling class fear that the loss of British control over India would mean so great a loss of British prestige that there would be unfavorable reactions in all fields of British activity. The conservatism, pride and prejudice of an alien ruling nation do not permit the British ruling class to believe in the ability of Indians to manage their own affairs, and also do not allow the British to realize that matters could be managed in any way other than their own. Hence, in relation to the immediate granting of the Congress demands, the second Round Table Conference has been a complete failure, and there will almost surely be a resumption of the civil disobedience struggle in India.

Nevertheless, the Conference has not been wholly barren. The attendance of Gandhi in London and the events there have accomplished certain results which will prove to be of great value to the eventual securing of a rightful place for India in the world. The knowledge of the outside world about the details of events in India since the spring of 1930 is meagre. Enough has been told to stimulate world curiosity and imagination, but both knowledge and the necessary preliminaries for knowledge have been largely lacking. The general assumption in the outside world has been that the British were such successful rulers all over their empire that probably their estimate of people and events in India was correct. But now enough has happened to weaken that assumption. World opinion changes very slowly, but it is now changing in respect to India.

First of all, the Conference has made clear to all the world that the other Indian delegates and the British delegates regard the Indian Congress with Gandhi at its head as the most powerful single political factor to be reckoned with in India. The fact that the Government deems it advisable to pit against the Congress, or at least take advantage of, not only its own power but also the communalist Moslems, the communalist untouchables, the Indian Princes, the European community in India, and the Anglo-Indians,—all this seems a clear tribute to the power of the Congress. The great efforts made by Lord Irwin to secure the Delhi agreement constitute a similar admission. The attitude of all the delegates, both British and Indian, toward the Mahatma at the Conference meetings, and the attitude of people at private meetings with him have the same meaning. All the world can see now that

the earlier British assertion that the Indian National Congress is a "negligible handful of intellectuals" is not true.

Secondly, the passage of months since the Delhi Truce have proved to world opinion that the Indian National Congress has discipline, patience, reasonableness, confidence in its chosen representative, and a sense of responsibility. Gandhi's attendance at London has showed the world that the Congress and its leaders are reliable,—are men who stick to their word.

As long as Gandhi was in India, conservative world opinion, especially that of the ruling classes in different countries, was inclined to accept British reports about him. But now the transactions in London have proved to the world that Gandhi is not a firebrand, that he is tactful, patient, skilful in discussion, gentle and courteous yet firm as a rock, incorruptibly honest, frank, kind, courageous, proof against flattery, quick-minded; that he has great grasp of detail as well as of the broader and deeper principles of Indian problems; that he is a great leader of men, a great statesman. It appears to the world that in Gandhi the British politicians and statesmen have met their equal and perhaps superior in political skill and certainly their superior in frankness.

Thus world opinion now realizes that India is more united and more effective politically than British statements for many years had led the world to believe. It is now clear that the Simon Report was badly mistaken in paying such slight attention to Gandhi and the Nationalist movement. Hence it would seem that both British and world opinion can now place less reliance upon the statements of Sir John Simon in relation to India. Looking back for only two years over the files of such British journals as the London *Spectator, The Round Table, The New Statesman* and *Atheneum,* the *Manchester Guardian,* the London *Times, The Saturday Review, The Nineteenth Century and After, The Contemporary Review* and many others, one thing is clear. All leaders, sections and parties of British opinion, with the possible exception at times of the Independent Labor Party, have steadily underestimated the power of Gandhi and of the Indian Congress; have underestimated the growth of the general desire for greater control of Indian affairs by Indians of all sorts; have overestimated the extent and depth of divisions among the various groups in India. These are mistakes natural to an alien ruling people. These mistakes still continue. But because of these mistakes over so long a period, world opinion henceforth will accept British assertions about Indian affairs with more caution and doubt. The British allegation that Indians are not fit for self-government now seems to the world open to question. There has been displayed some evidence to the contrary.

All shrewd observers can now see that Britain is taking advantage of Indian divisions and is relying on conservative forces in India which singly are not as strong as the Indian Congress. In view of recent history there is at least a question whether Indian Nationalism and the melting and uniting power of Gandhi's methods may not bridge over these divisions and gravely weaken the conservative groups. Hence there is certainly a question as to the security of British power in India.

From time to time in the past, British journalists, politicians and former Government officials have stated or implied that the Indian National Congress is hasty, impatient, violent of speech, unwilling to negotiate, intransigeant, weak, irresponsible, wild, impractical, lacking in foresightedness and statesmanship. If there was any hope that the second Round Table Conference would prove these allegations true before the eyes of the world, that hope has been disappointed. These British allegations have failed to materialize.

Gandhi's contact with the British working classes both in London and in Lancaster has won their hearts. His long talk with the large assembly of Labor members of Parliament brought cheers from them at the end. His private talks with thoughtful and religious middle class people have gained their regard and even reverence. Both British opinion and world opinion respect Gandhi and the Congress more than ever before. All this will make it more difficult for Britain to remain united against India as the struggle proceeds. It may help to lighten or shorten whatever sufferings India may yet have to undergo in the winning of her freedom.

If the Congress renews the civil disobedience struggle in India, as seems practically certain, I believe that world opinion would not blame the Congress. Without the second Round Table Conference, probably such blame would have accrued. But now the world would watch the struggle with much more careful attention and interest, to see brave, skilful and high-principled men and women trying to win freedom for their nation without violence.

The second Round Table Conference has lessened prejudice against India, gained her more respect, aroused more interest, removed barriers, and thus laid the foundation for greater understanding and sympathy and moral support for Indian freedom.

RICHARD B. GREGG.

Reflections on Dickens' "Christmas Carol"

Scrooge in his little wisdom cursed the feast
Of Christmas, but the Wise Men from the East
Have laid their treasures at their open doors
For Christian pilgrims to the London stores.

Lo, here a wishing well, and there a cave
(Sixpence a dip) and for the few who save
And gather into barns, their gold shall yield
Spoils of the mine, the forest and the field.

There with his sack (for seven and six a day)
Red-robed, white-bearded, on his reindeer sleigh
Old Santa Claus his thriftless past amends
And hawks his wares to swell the dividends.

Here may the passersby their guerdon see
Who 'friend the Mammon of Iniquity;
Blessed by the rich and honoured by the state
Their everlasting habitations wait.

DIVES, had I a store, there should you buy
A camel passing through a needle's eye
Complete with silver fittings, to assuage
Uneasy tremors in advancing age.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

A Christmas Meditation

We honor today, not the person of Jesus, but the Spirit of Universal Love by which he was inspired.

The worship of Jesus is not for us, but for us there is the worship of the things which Jesus worshipped. We seek the same spiritual guidance which he sought. We desire what he desired. We love what he loved. And we would give ourselves, heart and mind, to the great purpose to which he devoted his life.

Every spiritual grace and charm the mind can conceive were in him. He was a man in whose character were mingled all the qualities of beauty and truth. To a supreme degree he was master of the art of life; master of spiritual understanding; master of compassion and forgiveness; master of wisdom's highest activities; master of the knowledge of the needs and capacities and aspirations of the soul of man. There cannot be a greater, a more wonderful and sublime mastery.

To this very same quality of mind and heart, to this same mastery, we also are to attain. It is the sacred privilege of every human soul to be equally inspired by the Spirit of Universal Love.

On this Christmas Day our heart goes out to Jesus as to one who has shown us the beauty and truth of a spiritual way of living, one who has shown us that we too may have no thought or act that is not inspired of love. To him we give the sweet names of Comrade, Companion, Friend, Brother.

Above all things we desire to have in us that same mind which was in him. We desire that we may enter as he did into the oneness of all souls—into the spiritual fellowship of the world.

In no sense did Jesus desire any special honor for himself or that we should come to him saying, "Lord! Lord!" But it was his desire that we should give ourselves in love to Mankind.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

Toward a Solution of the Injunction Problem

"Wenn man dir gibt, nimm; wenn man dir nimmt, schrei," is an old maxim which the courts have long adhered to. It represents perfectly their attitude in the history of the labor injunction in the United States: When, in the latter part of the last century, employers discovered the possibilities of the labor injunction and tendered the courts the administration of this instrument, the courts were not slow to accept and exploit this newly-found responsibility. But when, on the other hand, Congress and various of the state legislatures have since tried to revoke or limit this authority, the courts have resisted to the utmost every attempt in this direction. Herein lies the answer to the question of why anti-injunction legislation has so signally failed to give labor the relief it has sought.

The reasons the courts have given for their refusal to give up this authority have been various: To do so would be to give up an essential prerogative of all courts, some say. No adequate remedy at law has been provided, say others. But whatever the reasons it must be apparent by now that *fiat* legislation directed against the courts' authority by legislatures has so far failed and, backed up by Supreme Court decisions, is likely to continue to fail in the future. The remedy, it appears to us, must come from another direction. It is the purpose of this article to try to point out what the author—a mere layman—conceives to be this direction.

Briefly stated, his proposition is that a solution of the injunction problem depends on a clarification of the whole subject of the legal status of labor. But, without going into this proposition thoroughly, there are one or two more immediate suggestions to be made.

In the first place, the common idea that concerted action on the part of labor is necessarily a conspiracy must be dealt with. True, the Clayton act and many state laws specifically state that trade unions are not to be considered conspiracies. But the tacit implication of many injunctive orders and the general feeling of the press and the public still is that a strike or a boycott is a conspiracy (even if not in the legal sense) and ought to be restrained.

Then, in the second place, must be taken into account our *laissez-faire* notion that it is none of the public's business what wages an employer pays, what conditions of work he imposes, how many hours he keeps him employees busy, or why he fires them. The doctrine that an employer may discharge an employee for any reason or for no reason at all, and contrariwise that an employee may quit for any reason or for no reason at all, is an outcome of this notion.

It is this attitude that allows an employer to cut wages and a union to call a strike without any previous notice on the part of either of an intention to do so, and then permits the courts to enter (after the declaration of war has been made and hostilities begun, so to speak) and impose conditions which, reasonable or unreasonable, must be complied with.

Finally, there is the matter of the "yellow-dog" contract and the common law rule forbidding any third party to urge either of the contractors to break it. It is these three matters which we wish to deal with here.

To a large part of the public, unions are mysterious groups of persons, irresponsible and without status. This is what constitutes "conspiracy" in the public mind. If it happens that some particularly strong union has gained recognition in a community and is no longer feared, a new intruder in the same field will none the less be looked on askance, particularly if it shows signs of being left-wing.

To get over this feeling of distrust, something more than a mere general declaration of public policy is needed. A public office should be provided for by the state in which every union, whether temporary or permanent, large or small, nation-wide or local, should be registered as such, with a statement of its officers, membership, conditions of membership, purposes, and the like. The mere registration of unions in a public office would help considerably to remove the stigma of conspiracy from their acts.

Along with the registration of unions, however, should go the registration of employers as well. This brings us to our second point—the right of the public

to know what conditions of work and wages employees are being offered. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that society ought not to interfere with the labor market or with the constitutional right of an employer to hire whom he will at whatever wage he can, we can still maintain the right of society to be cognizant of what prevalent wages and conditions of employment are.

But we can go further than this: Society may reasonably require that wages and other conditions of employment shall not be changed without fair warning —at least, when more than one or two employees are affected by the change. Hence we would provide that, say, ten days' notice shall be given by all registered employers, both to their employees and to the registration office, of any changes to be made in conditions of employment or in the number of persons employed.

The odor of conspiracy which clings to an association of employees has rarely, if ever, clung to the individual employer, even if he employs hundreds of workmen. Yet an employer's decision to reduce wages ten per cent is the same sort of thing, essentially, as a union's decision to demand a ten per cent raise in wages, so far as the public is concerned. It is to make this clear that we would require the registration of employers as well as of unions, and due notice on the part of the former of changes in conditions of employment.

If we demand that employers give this notice, however, we may reasonably require that unions similarly give previous notice of a proposed strike or boycott. Such a requirement would in itself also help to dissipate the conspiracy notion from the public's mind. Many of the larger unions—particularly the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in New York—have found it to their advantage to have lots of publicity before undertaking a strike. Certainly in the long run such publicity will do no union any harm.

These requirements of previous notice do not interfere with any constitutional right of either employer or employee to quit work or to change wages. They merely bring to the official public attention the fact that such events are scheduled to take place. They go, in other words, on the assumption that society is interested in such matters.

Now, having gone this far, we are in a position to wipe out one of the chief grievances against the labor injunction—its frequent issuance *ex parte*. Ten days' notice having been given by the employer that he intends to reduce wages, and seven days' notice having been given by the union that it intends to strike and picket, there can be no claim that irreparable damage will be done unless an injunction is granted immediately by a judge wakened in the middle of the night. The law can now reasonably require several days' notice of motion by the applicant for an injunction; it can reasonably require, further, that the applicant produce witnesses in open court with opportunity for cross-examination and rebuttal. And then it can reasonably require that the chancellor in equity lay down conditions for both parties and that the parties be guaranteed jury trial if the injunction is contemned. From all sides, the secrecy that makes for distrust will be removed.

When we turn from these considerations to that of the "yellow-dog" contract, we run into another instance of *"Wenn man dir nimmt, schrei."* We find once more that Congress and various state legislatures have attempted to legislate the "yellow-dog" out of existence simply by saying that such contracts are not binding and are not to be enforced by the courts. And once more we find the courts retorting, under the leadership of the Supreme Court, that such contracts are binding and that injunctions may issue to forbid a third party's inducing breach of them. Let us look at the situation a bit more closely.

An employer may require, as a condition of employment, that all prospective employees sign a contract agreeing not to become or remain a member of any union (except, perhaps, a company union) so long as they are in that employer's service. Now the employee may break that contract if he wishes, at the risk, of course, of being sued for breach of contract. So far, so good; no injunction can issue to prevent breach of contract. But the common law now steps in and says that if I, a third party, induce one of the contractors to break his contract, I may be enjoined from continuing to do so, and if I do continue to do so I will be held in contempt of court and thrown into jail to expiate my sins.

This is where the trouble comes, for the union that tries to organize an industry in which the employees are bound by "yellow-dogs" can be hailed before a chancellor in equity without any possible defense whatever on its part. What can be done about it? Admitting that probably nothing short of a constitutional amendment will affect the legality of "yellow-dogs," the remedy still seems simple enough: There is nothing to prevent the common law doctrine which forbids inducing breach of contract from being changed by statute. One can go as far back as St. Germain's "Doctor and Student" and John of Salisbury's "Polycraticus" or come as far front as the enactment of the workmen's compensation laws and discover nowhere a limitation on the right of legislatures to change the common law. All that need be done to destroy the effectiveness of "yellow-dogs" is to destroy the right which the courts now enjoy of enjoining a third party's inducing breach of these contracts. The contract itself is of little importance to the employer; it is the correlative right which now goes with it of keeping union organizers away from his employees that is important. There is a suggestion of this method of dealing with the "yellow-dog" in an obscure place in the revised Shipstead bill which was rejected by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, but it needs to be made more explicit.

Summing up these suggestions, then, we propose a bill worded somewhat as follows (with apologies in some particulars to proposed or already existing laws in the United States and England, and with the *caveat*, once more, that the author is a layman):

Be it enacted, etc.

Section 1. Whereas, (a) the settlement of trade disputes peacefully, justly and quickly is a matter of public interest; and (b) in order more readily to reach this end it is desirable that easy access to courts of equity shall be provided for all parties, that speedy settlement of cases shall be provided for, that fair means of appeal shall exist, that suits shall be undertaken only after fair and due notice to the other party or parties, and that decrees shall not be handed down without trial in open court with direct confrontation of witnesses; and (c) the legal status and rights of trade unions and employees is vague and undefined, which is not conducive to justice or to the speedy and equitable settlement of trade disputes; therefore, the following provisions are hereby enacted.

Section 2. (a) The term "trade union" for the purposes of this Act shall mean any combination of employees, whether temporary or permanent, the chief object of which shall be the

regulation of relations betweeen an employer and employees, or betweeen employers and employees, or between employees; but the presence of objects other than this shall not be construed to mean that any combination with such other subjects is not a trade union.

(b) The term "trade dispute" for the purposes of this Act shall mean any dispute between an employer and employees, or between employers and employees, or between employees concerning terms or conditions of employment.

(c) The term "employee" for the purposes of this Act shall mean all persons actually employed or seeking employment or lately employed in any trade or profession and all *bona fide* members of any trade union.

(d) The term "conditions of employment" for the purposes of this Act shall include hours and wages of labor, the physical working conditions of any factory or other place of employment, the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange hours and wages of labor or other terms of employment and discharge, or the recognition of trade unions.

Section 3. (a) All trade unions shall be registered at the office of ———, which registration shall include a statement of the objects of that trade union, its officers, membership, conditions of membership, etc.; *Provided,* that where the field of activity of any trade union shall lie wholly within one state, and an appropriate state office for registration of trade unions shall exist, registration of a trade union at that office shall satisfy the requirement of this Act.

(b) All employers of three or more persons shall be registered at the office of ———, which registration shall include a statement of the numbers of persons employed by him, and their conditions of employment, etc.; *Provided,* that where the field of activity of any employer shall lie wholly within one state, and an appropriate state office for his registration shall exist, his registration at that office shall satisfy the requirements of this Act.

Section 4. It shall not be unlawful for any person or persons, whether singly or in concert.

(a) To terminate any relation of employment or to cease to perform any work or labor; or to recommend, advise or persuade any other person or persons so to do;

(b) To cease to patronize or employ any person or persons; or to recommend, advise or persuade any other person or persons so to do;

(c) To pay or give to, or withhold from, any party to a trade dispute, any moneys or things of value; or to recommend, advise or persuade any other person or persons so to do;

(d) To assemble peacefully and lawfully for any lawful purpose; or to recommend, advise or persuade any other person or persons so to do;

(e) To attend at any place where any other person or persons may lawfully be for the purpose of obtaining or communicating information or of recommending, advising or persuading the doing of any lawful act or thing, including those heretofore enumerated or following; or to recommend, advise or persuade any other person or persons so to do;

(f) To recommend, advise or persuade any other person or persons to become or remain, or not to become or remain, a member of any trade union or employer organization, regardless of any contract, undertaking or promise to the contrary, nor to use any means of so recommending, advising or persuading which are not unlawful when used for any other lawful purpose or in the absence of a labor dispute;

(g) To do any act or thing which might be done for any other lawful purpose or in the absence of a trade dispute; or to recommend, advise or persuade any other person or persons so to do;

Provided, that where any of the acts heretofore specified are done concertedly and by previous agreement, seven days' previous notice shall have been given of intention to do such act to the parties concerned and to the office of ———, which notice shall, in the case of a trade union, be signed by its officers or by all or a majority of those who intend to participate in any such act.

Section 5. Every employer shall give ten days' previous notice to the parties concerned and to the office at which he is registered of any intention to change the conditions of employment of his employees or to terminate the relation of employer anad employee with them, where such intention will affect three or more of his employees.

Section 6. No court of the United States shall entertain any motion for any order to enjoin any person or persons from doing any of the acts specified in Section 4 of this Act if he or they are employees, or from changing the conditions of employment of his employees or terminating the relation of employer and employee with them if he is an employer, on account of any alleged irreparable injury to any property or property right of the plaintiff, or on account of any alleged lack of adequate remedy at law, unless at least three days' notice of motion shall have been given by the plaintiff to the defendant or defendants, or before said motion shall have been argued in open court (with opportunity for cross-examination of witnesses); *Provided,* that the ten or seven days' notice of intention to do any act or thing specified in Sections 4 and 5 shall have been given.

This act would further provide for trial by jury in the case of indirect contempts, for the posting of bonds by the plaintiff, for the automatic expiration of temporary injunctions within a limited time, and for maximum sentences for those found guilty of contempt. Those features we leave entirely to the experts.

There is, however, one more question which must be raised. It is this: Who is to administer the injunctive power in labor cases? Whether it would be wise in the end to set up separate industrial courts we cannot say. Certainly, however, if the attitude of the courts continues to be what it has been in the past, it will defeat every attempt to remedy the abuse of the injunction. It is on this, finally, that all efforts to correct this abuse depend for their success. But, perhaps, even for the courts, *E pur si muovere.*

T. Richard Witmer.

They Wait

Breathless they wait the swinging of a door:
Breathless they listen for the call of marching feet.
Slow ladles turn
While time a great white ingot hisses and hangs.

They wait
Bowed at machines who feed their children iron bread.
They wait
Sharp on the sky who waver on a thread of steel.
They wait
Starved gaunt who see no corn on their starved hills.

They wait
Women with shawls over their heads standing in salt in sausage factories.
They wait
Women who burn their bodies dry for figures on a watch.

They wait
An army of women their needles stitching pink thread into a nation's shroud.

They wait
A surly mob hands tied standing in bread lines and drinking the coffee of Capital.

Send them a savior then, since God is dead, greater than God and unafraid:
Send then a strong one then to swing the door,
To let forth terror and the seven beasts
To heal the world.

Mildred Fowler Field

The Christmas Treat

There is a melancholy cheer
That comes on Christmas once a year,—
The one time when the heart beats true;
We give the poor a Christmas treat,—
The only day the whole year through
When some folks get enough to eat.

Charles G. Girelius

The Study Table

"Greatest Thoughts on Immortality"*

After one has read this book one is inclined to say with Martineau, "We do not believe in immortality because we have proved it, but we forever try to prove it because we believe it." Moreover, after having read the testimony of this vast group of writers one is moved to exclaim, therefore and herewith it is true!

Professor Helder has rendered a most valuable service by gathering together this excellent material from such a variety of sources. In it there speak the religious leaders of Protestantism, Catholicism and Judaism, the agnostics and skeptics. What strikes one as altogether important is that immortality is a kind of universal instinct among men; and though some individuals, as for example Bertrand Russell and H. L. Mencken seem to deny a positive belief in immortality, yet by an indirect method they affirm its necessity in feeling sorry for themselves because they have no such positive belief.

When therefore the testimony of two hundred of the world's leading minds of such almost infinite variety of beliefs, religious training and scholastic attainment, express their belief in immortality, then indeed is one obliged to pause and listen. It seems altogether impossible that testimony of this high character should be thrown out of court. To be sure, their testimony does not establish the fact, any more than the testimony of two hundred men could be used as proof to establish the fact that the world is round instead of flat. What this does is to show that no matter how much men may argue about immortality, men will go on living as if it were true!

It is utterly impossible to select from among these two hundred writers one or two which may be taken as representative of the book. They are as diversified as flowers in a garden, and just as beautiful, and even as fragrant. Each expresses the particular reaction of the individual to the reality we call life; and yet amid this vast diversity there is a grand underlying unity of affirmation.

Such a book is most valuable, not as a text book from which one can obtain by logical deductions conclusions that will prove immortality to be true, as one would demonstrate an equation in mathematics. On the contrary, one ought to have this book close at hand, so that when the spirit begins to droop, it can turn to its pages, and from its atmosphere inhale a healing touch.

One is forced to the conclusion upon finishing the reading of this book that the belief in immortality is inseparably bound up with man's faith in a trustworthy, dependable, value-conserving universe. When therefore man lets go of this great belief there will go with it his belief in immortality also; and with its going he will seal his doom upon the face of the earth. And so with the great stoic, Marcus Aurelius, we are bound to exclaim, "It is good to die if there is a God, and sad to live if there is not." If this is a moral universe then there is a God, and if God lives then man is immortal; but if there is no God, then man is not immortal, and his belief in immortality is only one more of those ghastly delusions by which he drives himself to live this sham men call life.

What this book tries to tell is that man will grow old of heart, world-weary, smitten with palsy of soul, and grey with a sense of futility, making of life a grave of songs unsung save as he makes the heroic venture to impose upon himself a higher belief than logic and "proofs" conclude to be true!

W. Waldemar W. Argow.

*"Greatest Thoughts on Immortality," by Professor J. Helder, Publisher, Richard R. Smith, $2.00.

West Meets East

Whether a man believes in the theory of reincarnation or not, one cannot deny that a man often passes through experiences which may be regarded as "living many lives in one." From this point of view, the title of this book,* "The Lives of a Bengal Lancer," is accurate; because in this work the author has depicted the story of various stages in the evolution of his life.

In 1905 F. Yeats-Brown, at the age of eighteen, set sail for India to join the British Indian cavalry—the Bengal Lancers. He served in India until the World War broke out and then fought on the western front (France) and in Mesopotamia. He was wounded, as well as held a prisoner in Turkey. After the World War, he came to India and fought against the northwestern frontier tribesmen. During this period of life, he played the role of a British officer, a sportsman, a polo player, a hunter, an aviator and at the same time a man who wished to know something of India and her people and also that phase of Indian life which is generally a closed book to the alien ruling class. The book has been described by many critics as a remarkable one because of its colorful description of adventures as well as of this attempt of a westerner—especially a British military man—to understand the inner life of the Indian people.

I shall not discuss any details of the various stories in the book. I wish to emphasize the fact that there is nothing like the East and West as water-tight compartments. In the West, even among the military class, there are people who have genuine inclination to fathom the secrets of life and who long to find "peace in life" instead of excitement of mere living.

Furthermore the author makes it clear that all western men and women are not mere superficial observers of things Indian. Mr. Yeats-Brown's observations regarding the significance of Benares, the temples of Juggernaut and Madura, and his search for a Guru are highly interesting and instructive for all, including Indians.

This English officer, who sincerely wished to know something of Indian spiritual life, some of the Yogic practices, after all found his Guru. He did so when he ceased to care for sport and soldiery, and felt a real desire for a higher life. His conversations with his Guru, whom he calls "Bhagwan Sri," and his two disciples, Sivanand and Hastini, are of great value to those who wish to get an idea of Indian philosophical thought and spiritual life in practice. The appendix of the book is important. Here the author gives an interpretation of "Yoga" as he understands it from his own experience (pp. 291-295). Among other things he writes:

Yoga, as I know it, is monistic. "All that exists is one, though sages call it by different names." Many centuries after

*"The Lives of a Bengal Lancer," by F. Yeats-Brown. Published by the Viking Press, New York. $2.75.

these Vedic words were written St. Athanasius was made responsible for the idea that "the reasonable soul and flesh is one man. One, not by conversion of God-head into flesh; but by taking of the manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person." There is no notion in Yoga, as I know it, of a divinity distinct from Self, no doctrine of a Creator ruling His Universe from outside Heaven. Such a possibility may be admitted or implied in some Hindu scriptures, but my Guru, at any rate, concerned himself entirely with Man and His Becoming. Yoga is the study of You. . . (p. 291.)

The author is convinced that Jesus Christ was a yogi. He thinks that some of the Biblical healing miracles, such as the story of Lazarus, can only be explained from the standpoint of the yogic practice. He says:

I am a Christian myself, and it seems to me clear that Christ based his teachings on a tradition existing in His time and country, and the tradition originally came from India, and is still being followed there, passing from father to son, from guru to cheela, with some accretions and superstitions perhaps, yet still one of the most ancient languages "in which men have spoken of their God." Consider, for instance, the healing miracles of Christ from the standpoint of the aphorisms of Patanjali. In the vivid and mysterious 11th chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, would appear to have been prepared for an ancient exercise, no doubt practised by the Essenes of that time as it is by the Copts today, and known in India as the *Kali-mudra*. (pp. 296-297.)

The author thinks some of the processes of meditation practised by the Jesuits are something like "dhyana." "The Jesuits, whose exercises Loyola may have borrowed from the Moorish mysticism, possess the nearest approach to *dhyana* in the West (pp. 295-296). The author thinks that from the standpoint of medical science, serious investigations should be carried on about yogic practices, which might lead to the discovery of important facts in the field of medical science (p. 296).

Mr. Yeats-Brown keenly feels that the people of the West, especially Englishmen who are ruling India, have not tried to find out the real India. If they did, they would have found many persons of genius in the country. He recognizes the greatness of the people who can produce men like Bose, Raman, Shah, Tagore and Gandhi, even under the most adverse circumstances. He says: "There are philosophies in India which the nations need. . . ." (p. 266.)

I may say that the real value of the book lies in an unbiased appraisal of the ideals of life behind Hindu philosophy by a British military man. This book will remove much misconception about India and Hinduism. It will therefore aid the cause of better understanding between the East and the West. The book should be read by every British official, every English man and woman in India, so that it may help remove some of their prejudices which are after all based upon their ignorance and assumed superiority. The people of India must learn all that is best in the West, and the leaders of the West should lead the way for proper appreciation of all that is best in eastern life. In this lies the salvation of the present-day world full of conflicts.

TARAKNATH DAS.

Note

A French edition of Dr. J. T. Sunderland's "India in Bondage" has just appeared in Paris, from the Press of the University of France.

Correspondence

Friends of Russia

EDITOR OF UNITY:

There seems to be a special effort just now, through the press and otherwise, to stir up ill-will against Russia. Many of us regret this, and would like to do something on the other side.

One thing that we can do is to join the "Friends of the Soviet Union." Membership does not imply approval of all the Soviet policies. The society aims to promote mutual understanding and good will between the Russian people and the people of other countries; to urge recognition of Russia by the United States, with full privileges of trade; and to oppose all attempts to draw us into making war upon Russia, either by an economic boycott or by military intervention.

Anyone in sympathy with these objects can become a member by sending a dollar to the Friends of the Soviet Union, 80 East 11th St., New York City; or the membership fee may be paid in quarterly instalments of 25 cents.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Boston, Mass.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 218)

day and night in solitary confinement in a dark cell.

A man was driven almost insane by 12 months' solitary confinement when on remand awaiting trial for an offense of which he was finally proved innocent.

Women and girls under constant surveillance and at the mercy of armed male warders.

Thirteen prisoners in one cell, several suffering from tuberculosis and others from venereal disease.

A procession of six young men, stripped naked to the waist, their hands tied behind their backs, driven along the street by a party of soldiers. Each man's back was a mass of sores; one man's shoulder blade was exposed, showing the bone surrounded by a yellowish patch of dead flesh which was again encircled by blue and livid skin. A placard was carried in front of these prisoners to say that they had been beaten for stealing and gambling.

The confinement of prisoners in cells described as "chimneys"; one man was left there without food or drink for five days; another for one day and one night.

"We are subjected to beast-like tortures. I myself was kicked and beaten with rifle butts and bludgeons till I fainted. A. was tortured so frightfully that he went mad. He is still in prison but in a strait waistcoat. B. committed suicide by jumping out of the window. Many have tried this and failed. . ."

"I have seen a place of detention more nearly resembling an out-of-date and disused stable than a place for human beings. This place has a stone floor. The prisoners had to lie on the floor or stand up; no covering was provided for them. The climate is hot and damp and accompanied by the lowering of the evening temperature usual to such climates. There is no sanitation. No food is supplied to the prisoners and they are dependent on their friends. I knew two youths, both under twenty years of age, who had committed no crime but had grumbled about conditions on board their ship, which was a European ship. In company with other young men of the ship's crew, they were handed over and imprisoned. Two of those lads died. They contracted pneumonia."

A crowd of prisoners of different races and colors, some of them of a most depraved type, huddled together in one cell.

The Howard League claims that if cases of this kind were reported to an international body set up by the League of Nations, the world publicity which attends the work of the League would so instruct public opinion that the continuance of such barbarities would be rendered impossible.

International Aspects of Penal Administration

(a) *Direct.* Penal administration has a directly international aspect in the following circumstances:

1. *Nationals of one country arrested, accused, tried, acquitted or sentenced to fine, imprisonment or death for offences against the law in another country.*

An alien under arrest may suffer unduly before his innocence is established or his guilt proved, if the circumstances surrounding his detention are not in accordance with the general standards of civilized communities for the treatment of prisoners.

2. *Arrest by the police of one country on a warrant issued in another country for the surrender of a fugitive criminal in terms of a Treaty of Extradition.*

The extradition of fugitive criminals is a recognized factor in international relationships, though it is carried out by special treaties between particular States. Compliance with claims for the surrender of accused persons may not unreasonably be held to involve moral responsibility for their subsequent treatment on the part of the State surrendering. Thus, for instance, Portugal and Rumania, having abolished the death penalty, recognize this principle by reserving the right to refuse to surrender a fugitive accused of a crime punishable with death in the country applying for extradition.

3. *Nationals of one country deported from a foreign country after serving a term of imprisonment.*

An international organization could provide for these persons, preventing their return to the crime centers in the big cities and securing for them, through local and national agencies, the help which will rehabilitate them.

(b) *Indirect.* Penal administration has a less directly international aspect in the following circumstances:

1. *Health.* Insanitary and overcrowded cells and prisons, and disregard of precautions against infection, all lead to a spread of disease far beyond prison walls.

2. *Prison Labor.* Goods manufactured, produced or mined by the labor of prisoners enter international commerce thereby coming into competition with the products of the country to which they are transported.

Certain countries have found it necessary to prohibit the importation of prison-made goods.

3. *Juvenile Delinquency.* The welfare of children already forms part of the work of the League of Nations.

Public opinion is increasingly aware of the unsatisfactory state of the prison system and of penal methods, and there is already a body of experience which should be available to all States.

Apart from the foregoing, the existence of the International Prison Commission proves that the international nature of the problem has long been recognized.

World Problems Can Only Be Solved by the League of Nations

With all the respect due to this distinguished body and the work that it has performed, notably in regard to its preparation of a "Set of Rules for a Minimum Standard of Treatment for Prisoners," the Howard League submits that no adequate reform can be secured without the assistance of unofficial as well as official opinion, and there is no organization except the League of Nations which can collect data on a world-wide basis, and, having stated the problem, can enable the world to co-operate in its solution.

The League of Nations has already recognized this principle by the great work that it has done in regard to Health, the Drugs Traffic, the Traffic in Women and Children, and other such problems. In connection with the Progressive Codification of International Law, the Committee of three Jurists, whose Report was presented to the Council of the League in June, 1929, suggests that there should be "Conventions on international criminal law and conventions on mutual assistance between States with a view to the punishment of criminal offenses."

The Howard League believes:

(1) That the conscience of mankind is shocked by the continuance of the barbarous treatment of prisoners referred to in the early part of this memorandum;

(2) That any conditions of penal administration, which are inconsistent with social justice, are a menace to the peace of the world;

(3) That there is a genuine and widespread desire for progress and for knowledge as to the improvements that can best be carried out;

(4) That the League of Nations is the only body which can effectively collect information and mobilize world opinion.

Therefore the Howard League respectfully and urgently requests the League of Nations to set up a Commission of persons qualified, not only by official or legal experience, but also by active participation through their national societies in the work of Penal Reform. It suggests that this Commission should study existing methods of penal administration with a view to drafting a Convention which shall include, amongst other provisions, the International Prison Commission's "Set of Rules" and so establish an effective international standard for the treatment of persons in captivity.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Ralph Waldo Emerson's
VIEWS ON WAR
in four-page article may be had by sending six cents and stamped self-addressed envelope to
MRS. HENRIETTE POSNER
552 Humboldt St., Rochester, N. Y.

The Poetry Editors of UNITY,
LUCIA TRENT and RALPH CHEYNEY
offer in their new joint book:
DREAMERS' HOUSE
a charming Christmas gift for your friends and a book you will appreciate having in your library.
Foreword by Glenn Ward Dresbach. Publisher: Robert Packard & Co., Chicago.
$1.60, postpaid
Order, autographed, from its authors at 259 South 44th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

A GIFT FOR A FRIEND
A Special Offer of UNITY
New Subscriptions
$2.00 for one year, to include the
GANDHI NUMBER
Containing articles by:
Mahatma Gandhi
John Haynes Holmes
Louis I. Newman
Haridas T. Muzumdar
Stephen S. Wise
Marie Falconer
Marguerite Emilio
J. T. Sunderland
Curtis W. Reese
L. N. Gubil Sandaresen
J. C. Kumarappa
Send your order early to
Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago